

The Problems in Indian Historiography

* K. V. Ramakrishna Rao

Introduction: Even after the independence the Indian Historiography has been plagued with certain problems, issues, questions, uncertainties, puzzles which are yet to be tackled, answered and settled by the Indian historians and historiographers. Except few, majority of scholars has not been freed from the clutches of British, Colonial, Euro-centric, Marxist interpretations one way or the other and same identified are as follows:

1. Assumptions and presumptions have been made to build up certain premises on which hypotheses put forward.
2. Such hypotheses have been taken as theories without any further systematic study or research.
3. Even the validity of such automatically turned theories or otherwise have not been critically analyzed to be taken as theories.
4. The dates earlier mentioned carefully as *circa* have been taken many times conclusively and the other dates fixed accordingly.
5. The tentative and approximate chronology constructed by Vincent A. Smith¹ has been accepted without any cross checking, verification and research.
6. None has questioned, tackled or verified effectively ***the sheet anchor of the Indian history or the earliest absolutely certain precise date that is just named 326 B.C*** as fixed by the British writers.

7. They have not answered to the main accusation that Indians have no sense of history, history and so on.
8. In spite of vast literature, inscriptions and other comparative contemporary evidences, they have not attempted to use such materials.
9. Even today, scholars have been engaged in fighting with each other ideologically with professional bias instead of solving or settling the important problems concerning Indian history.
10. They are mustering evidences and suppressing others only with an intention to prove or disprove what others say instead of for constructive, objective and useful historiography.
11. If they are not able to counter with evidences, they resort to personal attack on the writers and scholars, stooping down to the level of verbal terrorism.

Therefore, the scholars should come out from their subversive ideologies, fixed mindsets, political affiliations and trans-territorial loyalties for genuine, fair and objective Indian historiography. Though, there might be many such problems, some of them are taken up and discussed in this paper for the consideration of historiographers.

1. **Aryan – Dravidian Race hypotheses and theories: “I have declared again and again**

* 25. (old.9) Venkatachala Iyer street, West Mamabalam, Chennai - 600033.

that if I say Aryan, I mean neither blood nor bones nor hair nor skull, I mean simply those who speak an Aryan language.....To me an ethnologist who speaks of Aryan race, Aryan blood, Aryan eyes and hair, is as great sinner as a linguist who speaks of dolicocephalic dictionary or a brachycephalic grammar".

Thus confessed the inventor of "Aryan race" in 1888 itself². But the propagator of Dravidian race had not declared so and the Aryan – Dravidian race hypotheses and theories continue. Race and language are two different concepts and entities, but in Indian context, the influenced scholars always try to confuse both for political purposes. After the two World Wars, the scholars realized the pseudo-scientific nature of the race hypotheses and theories and dumped into dustbins. Even the U.N passed resolution that the term race should not be used. But, Indian scholars have been still race conscious, racist in their views and racist in interpreting the religious, social, political and economic processes in terms of Aryans and Dravidians. Even Marxist historians know the carrying over the fallacy and have been careful in their writings. They say³ that archaeologically there was no Aryan invasion, but the language speaking peoples were there and their movement! In the colonial historiography, the invasion hypothesis and theory had been a feature to justify their invasion, enslavement, exploitation and colonization. However, such hypothesis to become a theory, the following conditions should be satisfied:

1. There should be an invader.
2. There should be an invaded.
3. There should be a reason to invade.

4. There should be a vulnerable or weakened condition existing in the invaded.
5. Decimation of native population.
6. Disruption of economy and communication.
7. Widespread destruction of property.
8. Forcible removal of native power structure and substitution of a new power structure administered by the alien invaders.

But nothing had or has been proved by archaeological evidences in Indian context. In fact, the existing and present archaeological evidences prove no Aryan invasion⁴. H. D. Sankalia⁵, a noted archaeologist pointed out the danger in spreading such unproved hypotheses and theories:

"Assumptions or hypotheses are the soul or pillars of research. These should, doubtless, be judiciously made and not be dogmatic. For very often, thought very haltingly made on inadequate data, they are passed on as gospel truth. Witness for instance the late Rev. Fr. Heras' identification of the Harappans with Dravidians and Wheeler's attribution of this civilization to the Aryans. For as Hitler's Germany, these two hypotheses have done incalculable harms in setting up the South against North. Smouldering antagonism against Bhahmins and so-called Aryan Brahmins have taken the space of a political vendetta".

Thus, though western and Indian scholars have started reassessing the myth of Aryan invasion, the Dravidian historians,

Dravidologists and Dravidian protagonists have vehemently struk to these hypotheses and theories. But they should carefully go through the available evidences. It may be noted that the western scholars have cleverly made the Dravidians also entered India like Aryans. In fact, James Fergusson⁶ suggested a third race **Dasyus** besides Aryans and Dravidians. It may be noted that the Dravidian scholars treat both **Dravidians and Dasyus** are one and the same. In fact, according to them they know very well that without Dasyus, there is no interpretation of Aryan invasion derived from the *Vedas*.

Augustin Thierry began by interpreting English history in terms of the race struggle between Saxon native and Norman invader. The same methodology was followed and applied to the histories of the colonies to sow the seeds of division. As the history was also been written by the British they interpreted the same in terms of race struggle between Dravidian natives and invading Aryans in India⁷. They have made much fuss about the choronology of history of other civilizations, particularly Indian, but have not questioned anything about themselves. Benjamin Constant in his famous pamphlet, "The Spirit of Conquest and Usurpation in Europe" (1813) brings out the truth:

"Our fanatical reformers purposely confuse choronology to kindly and keep up hatred just as some had gone back to the Franks and Goths to find pretexts in order to express in the opposite direction" (PP. 121-122; 9 in).

Jacques Barzun⁸, while discussing about the professional bias, exposes the motive of the British scholars, clearly as follows:

"The historians Fauriel, Merimee and Augustin Thierry were in touch with De Stutt de Tracy as late as 1821 and Buches summed up in his characteristically titled *Introduction to the Science of History* (1833) the complex ideas and beliefs relevant to the study of race".

Therefore, instead of emotional attachment to race, blood, language and other spurious, pseudo and unscientific hypotheses⁹, scholars should free themselves from such narrow parochial, sectarian and chauvinistic outlook to deal with the history in an objective manner.

2. The Development of Script, Language and Literature:

The concept of script and language are two separate entities. There are scripts without languages or still undeciphered, because of human ignorance or deficiency and languages without script. It is not necessary that each language should have only one script, or because one script is used for two or more languages, other language-speaking people should treat that language as alien. Language and literature may appear to be related, but still have separate entities. There are languages without literary traditions – tropical Africa and variety of distinct languages each with its own literary tradition – India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Cyprus. Therefore, the people without script are not pre-historical (period without written records for historical purpose) and their history cannot become pre-history or the people with script but without literature can become historical (period with written records). Just to cover up this mess, the expression **proto-historic period (in the formative period of history!)** is used. The following questions should be answered without mincing the words:

1. As the Indus Valley script has not been deciphered, can it still be considered belonging to **pre-historic** period with the advanced status of civilization and amenities?
2. Scholars say that Indo-European languages are the oldest and Sanskrit is the oldest of the group. But, Sanskrit inscriptions are available only from first century BCE, whereas, its literature is dated to 2500 BCE! How then, the language existed without script?
3. How the Sanskrit-speaking people were nomadic with such refined and literary language?
4. Tamils claim that their language is the ancient, perhaps older than Sanskrit. Then, the following questions should be answered:
 - a. Had Tamil been the developed language, the inscription could have been very well in Tamil script instead of Brahmi in the 3rd century BCE.
 - b. Can it be said that, therefore, it could have been developed into classical language only after this period i.e, 300 BCE?
 - c. Do they accept the datings of Sangam literature during the first centuries, Five Great Epics 3rd to 7th centuries, Tolkappiyam 9th century and so on?
 - d. Now, Marxist scholars say there was no State formation during the Sangam period. Does it imply that Tamils were leading a tribal life?
Therefore, scholars should deal this aspect carefully without any bias, prejudice and partiality.

3. **The Intellectual and Material Progress and Development:**

The western scholarship has defined progress and development differently according to their own convenience and used in subjects variously to suit their convictions¹⁰. But, the Indian scholars have understood improperly or having understood properly have applied with their ideological orientation confusing the historical processes. Intellectual progress is related to high mental development exhibited in the refined language, literature, arts and sciences. Thus, the intellectual progress is reflected in their material culture, progress and development. The Western, British, Imperialistic or Colonial historiographers may accuse that Indians might be having an advanced and thus progressed civilization, but it was and is not developed one, because such progress had and has not been continuous one.

The following facts as has been accepted are noted:

1. India has the oldest language Sanskrit, which is also the oldest of the European or Indo-European language family.
2. India philosophical system has been oldest.
3. India has the credit of inventing zero and infinity and decimal number system.
4. India has the oldest civilization with archaeological remains.
5. India had been ruling the ocean because of its extensive oversea trade and business, that is why the ocean touching India was named as Indian Ocean long back.
6. India had been the prosperous and exporting goods (even up to 1920s) and thus, the Europeans wanted to find a sea route to India.

Then, how India has been accused as barbaric, heathenish, irreligious, infidel people indulging in magic and snake charm, worshipping devils and demons, throwing themselves before Juggernaut, committing suicide in the waters of Ganges, burning widows on the lines of Curzon, Macalauy, Mayo and others¹¹? If India was so barbaric, why the West and Europe wanted to come to India, buy Indian goods and so on? Were Indian goods civilized, but Indians uncivilized? How then uncivilized could produce civilized goods? Therefore, the mental and, material development and progress should go together and the ancient Indian historical processes have to be analyzed, understood and interpreted accordingly.

4. Development of Science and Technology:

Vedic literature (datable to 4500/3500 BCE or before) has ample evidences for the development of science and technology during the material period of its composition. Therefore, such knowledge and application of knowledge must have been evolved, experimented, perfected, developed earlier and put into use then. Indus Valley Civilization (hereinafter mentioned as IVC) has material evidences for the following:

1. The extant of the ancient astronomical works like Vedanga Jyotisha by Lagadha (c.1400 BCE), Surya Siddhanta etc prove the highest standards of mathematics and astronomical subjects and studies in India.
2. Decimal system was used (3500 BCE). The standard size of the bricks, weights and measures found prove the fact.
3. The seals clearly show the usage of number system. The model symbol of infinity has been borrowed from the seals.

4. The human figurines (the red sandstone torso of a man) prove the perfected sculpture technology - cutting, hewing, chipping, chiselling, carving, engraving, forming, finishing, niche completing etc. and these processes are not possible without usage of high tensile implements.
5. The copper figures (dancing girl etc.) prove the established fact of metalurgy in all aspects — refinement of ore, alloying techniques, pattern making, moulding, metal melting to thousands of degrees, casting etc.
6. This clearly proves the usage of Iron implements during the material period.
7. The copper technology of IVC has close link with that of Rajasthan and other areas.

Therefore, the interpretation that India had to wait till the invasion of Alexander in 326 BCE to receive all arts and sciences from the West and then develop and progress is not tenable. The historiographers could critically analyze to come to any conclusion.

5. Horse in India: The recent controversy about the horse in Harappa brewed by the Marxist scholars clearly prove that their attempts have been not to disprove the existence of horse but the ideological usage of horse. Undue importance and much publicity has been given during the last six years for this issue, evidently started by R. S. Sharma and his colleagues⁸. They have clearly indulged in the propaganda about the introduction of horse by the invading Aryans around 2000 BCE in northern India. The *Frontline* and the *Hindu* have publicized and now readers have been very clear about the issue.

Fossils of horse, their depiction in teracotta, rock paintings and in IVC seal are tabulated as follows:

Sl. No.	Representation	Place where found	Datable to / period	Specie / conclusion	Reference
1.	Fossils of horse	Upper Siwalik		Equus sivaensis	Wadia, Geology of India
2.	Fossils of horse	Pinjor stage	Pleistocene	Equus	—do—
3.	Terracotta figure	Lothal	IVC		S. R. Rao, Lothal and Indus Valley Civilization, pl.XXIII.A.
4.	Horse seal		IVC	May be a horse	Mackay, Further Excavations at Mohanjodaro, I, p.289, II, pl. LXXVII,II
5.	Horse in rock paintings	Bhimbetka, Bhopal	c.30,000YBP	Horse	Wankakar, Rock Paintings of Madhya Pradesh
6.	Horse in rock paintings	Tamil Nadu	c.2000 BCE	Horse	Report of Tamil Nadu State Archaeological Department, Taramani
7.	Tarracotta figure	Lothal	IVC	Horse	S. R. Rao, Lothal and Indus Valley Civilization, p.89.
8.	A painting on pottery	Rangpur			M. G. Dikshit, excavations at Rangpur BDCRI, X

The debate going on in the *Frontline and the Hindu* the following tendencies can be noted:

1. No scholar has denied that there was no horse in the IVC.
2. For the invading Aryans, there was no Archaeological evidence.
3. They are not worried about the usage of horses and chariots by Dravidians as reflected in the Sangam literature.
4. If there was no horse in India before 2000 BCE and Iron in South India before 1000 BEC, then the Tamil poets must be lying in their Sangam literature about them.
5. It is not known as to why they had not brought any horses while entering from northwest leaving their remnant language in Bruhui as claimed by the scholars.

H. D. Sankalaia¹³ dealing with the Harappan horse specifically pointed out that **the traditional view point that the Aryans brought in or introduced the horse might not be far wrong.**

6. **Roman Coins In India:** Roman coins in India, particularly in south India has been shrouded with mystery, as they were in circulation after their cessation in their own country. Parameshwari Lal Gupta, Stuart Piggott and other scholars¹⁴ have raised the following questions about the findings of Roman coins in south India:

1. Was it a trade?
2. Was it a tribute paid to the Indian Kings by the Romans?
3. If it was a tribute, was it due to trade practice or the Romans were defeated by the Indians?,

4. If the South Indian traders accepted them for bullion value, why they did not melt instead of keeping them in circulation?

5. The availability of Roman coins in the strata has been taken as "**Roman datum**" and the dates of settlements found below and above the deposits containing them and the tombs containing pottery of types which occurred in the settlement, could all be put into their correct chronology?

6. The faked Roman coins had been in circulation up to 4th-5th centuries. Then, how to differentiate them from the genuine ones?

In fact, P. L. Gupta has suggested that scholars should thoroughly study the aspect of Roman coins in South India.

7. **Non-Fixation of Independent stone and metal ages for Indian Culture:** The Danish

archaeologists Thomson and Worsaae introduced the system of Stone, Bronze, Iron periods or ages in the first half of the 19th century and it was started to be used by others. The Archaeologists, historians and other connected scholars know very well that the usage of the words – **age and period** is incorrect. As evolutionary theory is adopted in such a theory, the generalization that men of all ages and civilizations should have progressed only through such pre-determined cultures is totally incorrect. They openly agree that application of generalized chronology to Indian lithic and metallic cultures is incorrect and they do not conform to the European standards. But, they continue to adapt and adopt such chronology without any modification, equating and comparing superficially with other non-Indian cultures, which were not even contemporaries in many cases.

Sl. No.	Stone age	Evolutionary age	Mental age	Remarks
1.	Palaeolithic	Teeth	Writing	Though the ancient extant literature is there, there was no writing to corresponding period.
2.	Microlithic	Stone	Philosophy, logic and mathematics	Though there is the ancient extant philosophy, they are not recognized and mentioned as borrowers from Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks, Romans and so on.
3.	Mesolithic	Wood	Literature	Though the literature is the ancient, it has been pitted against Tamil based on race hypotheses and theories.
4.	Neolithic	Copper	Science and technology	Though there have been many developed conditions, the historians do not care to correlate with other material evidences in their interpretations.
5.	Megalithic	Bronze	Art and architecture	Though there have been remarkably notable feature and mathematics peculiar to India, hypotheses and theories of borrowal, migration etc., are relied upon denying the credit to Indians.
6.		Iron	Trade and Commerce	Though Indians were trading with others. It is a Wonder that the westerners always wanted to find sea route to India and trade with Indian goods calling India as a barbaric / Heathen / infidel nation.

7.	Machine	Law and judiciary	Though India has remarkably the ancient well codified law books, there have been many Thomas Maines to discredit India.
----	---------	-------------------	---

To suppress and sidetrack this main issue, western scholars have started interpreting agrarian, postoral, urban, rural cultures could have only such and such features and therefore, they might not have had the gadgets and implements of advanced and progressed ages and periods. But, this argument may not be consistent with the material evidences available as pointed out.

8. Iron and Iron technology in India: The controversy of Iron and Iron technology in India has been introduced with much bias without going into the details or purposely suppressing the connected facts. The following evidences are given to prove the existence of Iron and steel technology in India during 3000-1500 BCE:

Sl. No.	Details of Material evidence	Date / period	Place where found	Involved metallurgical processes	Implied / applied iron technology
1.	The Human figurines (the red sandstone torso of man)	Datable to 3000-2500 BCE	Indus Valley civilization	Prove the perfected sculpture technology-cutting hewing, chipping, chiselling, carving, engraving, forming, finishing, niche completing etc. and	These processes are not possible without usage of high tensile iron implements.
2.	The Copper figures (dancing girl etc.)	—Do—	Indus valley civilization	prove the established fact of metallurgy in all aspects refinement of ore, alloying techniques, pattern making moulding, metal melting to thousands of degrees, casting etc.	—do—
3.	A saw	—Do—	—Do—	The saw is with undulating teeth, which allowed the dust to escape freely from the cut simplifying the carpenter's job.	Prove the skill of carpentry.
4.	Iron ancors	datable to 3rd	Found in the archaeological excavations at	The acchniques techniques connected with organized shipping	Proves the developed status of marine

An Indian human head made of Bronze.	c.3700 BCE	Purchased by a private collector Harry Hicks in Delhi	The figure has been clearly Indian and the casting technique is remarkable. As per the nuclear tests conducted by Harry Hicks and Robert Anderson in the labs of USA and Switzerland, it is dated to c.3700 BCE.	expeditions Proves the metallurgical expertise of Indians.
--------------------------------------	------------	---	--	--

Another interesting feature of Indian Iron technology is the marvellous pillars manufactured with sophisticated metallurgical skill and expertise. Such developed technology could have taken place in modern age only 18th - 19th centuries. Then, how the Indians were having such technology in the first centuries of the current era? Could they have developed it all of a sudden without any scientific and technological background? When

Europeans could take thousand years to achieve such technology, how could Indians achieve immediately? Therefore, the continuous technological progress made from the IVC has to be taken into account of answer these puzzling questions. Therefore, the conclusion of modern scholars that the iron technology could have been developed in Copper technology is reasonable. The details are tabulated as follows:

Sl. No.	Where available / found	Length	Breadth / Diameter	Details	Date / period	Remarks
	Meharully, New Delhi	23' 28"	12.5" top 16.4" bot	Pure Iron	1st / 4th century	Unrust even after 1800-2000 years.
	Dhar	43' 6"		Broken into three pieces: 1. 24' 3" 2. 11' 7" 3. 7' 6"	10th / 11th century	Cross-sections Circular, Octagonal and square from bottom to top.
	Konark, Puri	23'	8"	Nine pillars in sun temple	11th / 12th century	Might imply astronomical significance.

The scientific analytical tests and studies reveal many interesting details of melting, casting, forging, welding, and furnace techniques of Iron making in ancient India.

Though the hypothesis and theories of Wheeler¹⁵, Gordon¹⁶ and others¹⁷ have been

disproved with the findings of iron in India about 1300 BCE, the historians purposely do not mention about them. Recently archaeologists Chakrabarti¹⁸, Prakash¹⁹ and Tripathi²⁰ have shown that iron was probably indigenous, discovered as a byproduct of copper smelting. Their conclusions are:

1. From the archaeological evidence and ethnotechnological evaluation, it is evident that iron was first appeared in India between 1300 and 1200 BCE.
 2. Ahar (1300 BCE), Gufkaral (1300 BCE), Atranjikhhera (1025 BCE), Tadkanhalli (1000+/- 150 BCE), Hallur (1000-900 BCE) amply disprove the technological migration theories of Wheeler, Gordon and others.
 3. The chronology of iron technology development, furnace design, the abundance of rich iron ore mineral and also the ethnological evidence indicate that iron technology was developed in India independent of its existence elsewhere.
 4. The earliest objects were purely wrought iron but gradually, iron craftsmen and smiths mastered iron making technology, forging and shaping and forge welding techniques.
 5. They also developed unique techniques of crucible steel, which became known worldwide as Wootz, later Damascus steel.
 6. The Delhi pillar is the standing master piece to prove the perfection iron and steel technology well ahead of other civilizations and cultures.
9. **Development of Stone Art:** The Western scholars and their Indian followers faithfully repeat the dictum that stone architecture was introduced into India only after the invasion of Alexander in 326 BCE and it was influenced by the Achaemenial tradition or the Achaemenian workers were used by the Mauryan empire. But, all keep silence or even do not mention about the Piprahwa stupa in Bihar on the Nepal Frontier. Recently, a scholar²¹ has raised a valid point about it questioning the bias of the scholars. They are summarized as follows:
1. The dating of Piprahwa as belonging to **450 BCE** in round numbers based on Buddhist relics by Vincent A. Smith is not scientific and totally baseless.
 2. When the Chaldean god at Eridy was influenced by India in representation and Indian wood, muslin and other goods could go to Chaldea in 4000 BCE, why Indian should learn Stone art from them?
 3. The Dwaraka explorations prove that stone was used for architecture as early as in 1500-1400 BCE period.
 4. The Indian who used the hand-axe (discovered by Robert Bruch Foote in 1863) 5,00,000 YBP and the authors of rock paintings of Madhya Pradesh of 30,000 YBP should wait for Alexander or Persians to learn stone art from them?
 5. The Sri Lankan evidences of Stone architecture (The Thuparama Stupa built by Devanampiyatissa 250-210 BCE, the Brazen Palace 161-137 BCE) explode the myth that Indians learned from others, because the distance between Greece and Pataliputra is/was 5000 kms. Then why the Greek architecture should take more than 100 years to pass from grandfather (Chandragupta Maurya 322-298 BCE) to his grandson (Ashoka 298-273 BCE), when the grandson's architecture could be prevalent at the same time at places separated by 2400 kms?
 6. And they say that grandfather was building with wood and the grandson with stone! How within years the grandson could learn the art suddenly and spontaneously?

While mentioning about the Achaemenian/Persian influence on Mauryan architecture, the Pallavas are assumed to have been descended from the Persians. However, the scholars do not explain the gap in between these historical processes. If the Mauryan stone art could have travelled to Sri Lanka immediately during or after the reign of Asoka in c.250 BCE, why the Pallavas should have developed their art only during 600-700 CE? As the western scholars could not explain the gaps between the cultures of IVC — 3500 BCE, Lomariishi cave — 1000 BCE (though roughly dated as 450 BCE in round figures by V. A. Smith), Mauryan period 250 BCE and Pallava period — 600-700 CE of 2000, 600 and 900 years respectively, in the first case, they denied the antiquity totally; in the second case, they tried to bring the date at par with Buddha; the third is their own fixed date. In the case of Pallavas, they could have very well put them at par with Ashoka as done in the case of Lomariishi, as they were also purported to be descended from the Persians/Pahlavas. But they fixed dated as they are followed in the text books. Therefore, the historians and historiographers should go into these details to find out the truth.

10. **Traditional Sites not excavated to find out the claimed Past:** Almost all of the traditional sites like Ayodhya, Banaras, Kamboja, Kumbakonam, Madurai, Rameswaram, Prayag, Pragyotisour, Patna, Ujjaini etc., have not been subjected to horizontal excavation to find out the claimed hoary past. H. D. Sankalia²² points out that there are no archaeological evidences to prove the existence of Ashoka, Chandragupta Maurya, Kanishka etc., and their magnificent palaces, because no horizontal excavation has been conducted at the sites associated with them. The discoveries of Dwaraka, sixteen lines Devanagari inscription and other artifacts found at Ayodhya, the so-

called bronze head of Vasistha etc. have been encountered with cold and hostile reception from the so-called Marxist scholars. In fact, they coolly maintain silence as if nothing has happened. Surprisingly, the responsible scholars had commented that such found inscription might have been planted there! They do not want to give any credit to the scholars involved in such findings, though they have been also equally professional, internationally renowned and so on. Therefore, these scholars cannot adopt two and double standards, when they really want to pursue true historical methodology.

11. **The gap between IVC and Mauryan empire:**

Historians, historiographers and other scholars, though, they know very well that there has been an inexplicable and unaccountable historical gap between the so-called pre-historic or proto-historic IVC (3500-2500 BCE) and historic Mauryan (250-100 BCE) periods, they keep silence and even researchers do not work on study about and present papers on it. A. L. Basham²³, K. D. Sethna²⁴ and others²⁵ have pointed out some connections between the periods:

1. The animal sculptures of Asokan columns derived their school directly from the engravers of the Indus seals.
2. Such animal representation, the crowning figures, postures, wheels, flora and fauna etc., too have link with the IVC.
3. The abdomens of the period resemble that of abdomen of the Harappa torso and give further evidence of the survival of tradition over the intervening period.
4. Terracotta figures and the art also prove that it was in existence before the Mauryan period and relate to that of the IVC.

5. The standard size bricks of IVC is followed throughout India.
6. The decimal system of weights and measures of IVC is followed throughout India.
7. The Copper technology of IVC continued as is evident from the Copper implements found in many parts of north India dated from 2000 BCE.

Therefore, the scholars have to answer the following questions without keeping silence or mincing words:

1. What happened between 2500 BCE and 500 BCE?
2. What Indians were doing between the intervening period?
3. What was their history?
4. What was going on in South India at that period?
5. The Puranic chronology mention about the rulers of India during that period. William Jones²⁶, F. E. Pargiter²⁷ and others²⁸ have recognized their rule and even attempted to construct the chronology, but later it was reduced down to 326 BCE coinciding with the invasion of Alexander.
6. How to fill up the gap? Just because, the scholars do not know or do not want to consider the available evidences, can we simply ignore the history of India of the period?
7. How such indifferent, callous and apathetic attitude of historians, historiographers and connected scholars could be to her?
8. Is it worth for them to adapt and adopt such historical methodology to suppress the history of India?

9. What they call the intervening period of pre-historic or proto-historic and historic periods historically?

12. The collision of India with the Asian Continent: The Kumarikkandam, Tamil Sangams and other connected theories are related to the dashing of Indian island (Jambu Dwipa / Navalantivu) with the Asian continent. The antiquity of Tamil literature and culture is connected with it. However, historians do not recognise these theories and the historians of Tamil Nadu themselves have divided. The vigorous pursuing scholars very often depend on the books of Alexander Kondratov²⁹, K. Appadurai³⁰ and others³¹ and do not go beyond it in providing plausible evidences. Therefore, the following factors have to be considered by the historians and historiographers:

1. There must be tremendous pressure exerted at the time of hitting resulting in the complete destruction/change of stratiography.
2. All the evidence of human life might have been destroyed completely, when the upper crust caved in with the formation of new crust. In such disturbed or even upside down stratiographical formation, no evidences possibly could be found. But, the human existence could not be denied.
3. Geologists claim that the Himalayas start to raise with the disappearance of Rajasthan Ocean. The Rajasthan desert is the proof and it is expanding with the rise of Himalayas even today.
4. The survived men from the submergence/deluges could have started their lives after some time and they need not have followed the archaeological scale of paleolithic, neolithic or megalithic or metal cultures.

5. That is, there are anomalies in the findings of the archaeologists like the absence of Iron before 1500 BCE, the riddle of mixing up of Iron technology with megalithic culture, usage of gold ornaments of all varieties including necklaces, bangles, nose rings, ear rings, waist girders, anklets etc., soap like substances used for bathing and their mode of dressing by megalithic people are surprising.

6. Absence of script for the classical languages Sanskrit and Tamil Before 3rd century but literature dated to 3000 BCE and 1000 BCE.

13. Tradition of tradition existing 2000 years

back: Tradition has been an important factor in Indian history like any other history. However, the Indian tradition has been disparaged, discredited and defamed like anything compared to other traditions. Perhaps in no other country, tradition has been considered false, heritage rubbish and literature myth as in India, that too as belived by the Indians themselves. When all other histories of Chaldeans, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks and Romans to have been based on traditions, why accept them and deny Indian with discriminations? Therefore, such despraging scholars should consider the following facts:

1. **Existence of tradition:** Tradition is the sum total belief of a person. Place and thing in culture, heritage and civilization because of the age-old practices, manners, customs, ceremonies etc. Therefore, the existence of tradition proves the antiquity of the followed and following people.

2. **Following of such tradition:** If such tradition has not been consistent with the factors of culture, heritage and civilization of the people, they would not follow such

tradition, as no tradition could be imposed on people artificially or forcefully. Therefore following tradition proves the continuation of historical processes of the possessed people.

3. Living and continuous tradition:

Tradition would be always living tradition, as the following people make it living. Thus, it would be continuing and continuous.

4. Tradition of tradition:

The tradition of tradition is very significant. If a tradition has been in existence for thousands of years or specifically more than 2000 years, such tradition becomes historical tradition and it cannot be ignored.

One can note easily that these factors are found in Indian society and India is still living with the same culture, heritage and civilization in spite of modernization, westernization and industrialization. Thus, the tradition of th epics and puranas can be scientifically studied to find out the truth. F. E. Pargiter, R. Morton Smith and others have attempted in such methodology and they have constructed the genealogy and chronology acceptable to modern scholars. Similar attempts can be made to construct the genealogy and chronology of Tamil Kingdoms since Sangam period.

14. **Conclusion:** In view of the above the historians, historiographers and other scholars should carefully consider the facts without any bias, prejudice and partiality to study independently and as well inter-disciplinary approach so that the historical riddles could be solved. The following conclusions may be drawn:

1. The historians, historiographers and other scholars who cannot go on harp on the same point or rehash their own writings

without respecting the other views or purposely suppress the facts.

2. Politicization and ideologization of history would neither help them nor the people.
3. Today, because of the dissemination of data and information, everybody is well aware of the historical processes and even common man can question the historians about their methodology and if they do not answer properly, none would care for them.
4. As they have also understood and identified the historians siding with

politicians, they would be very careful in dealing with historians.

5. Moreover, with the development of science and technology and IT discipline, the history is relegated to background and it is a fact that there are only few takers of the subject at university level.
6. Therefore, the historians, historiographers and other should be objective in winning the confidence of the people.
7. Their methodology should be used for the wellbeing of the people, society, nation and the world.

Notes and references

There have been comprehensive references available on the topics dealt with and therefore, the listed ones are only illustrative and not exhaustive.

1. Vincent Arthur Smith, The Oxford History of India, Clarindon Press, London, 1923, pp. xiii-xxiv.

The British writers have orchestrated tactfully by asserting that-

1. India has no history before Alexander's invasion (Vincent Smith in his all books.)
2. India has no proper history before Mohammedan invasion in 13th century (James Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p.7).
3. Indians had/have no sense of history.
4. Early India wrote no history because it never made any (A. A. Macdonell,).
5. Indians were very indifferent to history.

Then, they fixed *the sheet anchor of the Indian history or the earliest absolutely certain precise date that is just named 326 B.C.*:

1. Vincent A. Smith, "...the earliest absolutely certain precise date that is just named 326 BC".
2. Lord Elphinstone, "No date or public event can be fixed before the invasion of Alexander" (History of India, 5th Edition, p.11).
3. Max Mueller, History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, 1859, pp. 3-8 and p. 9 of Allahabad edition.
4. Fleet's article on "Epigraphy in the Indian Empire", Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. II, Clarindon. 1909, pp. 3,5,6.
5. Jas. Burgess, "We possess scarcely a landmark in history previous to the invasion of India by Alexander the Great in the fourth century B.C.". Ibid, p. 156.

Unfortunately, Indian historians have not tackled this main accusation in spite of their vast literature and other evidences. There are writers like A. L. Basham, who have given hints about it:

At the court of ancient Indian kings careful records were kept of the events of chief importance of realm, but unfortunately these archives are completely lost to us (A. L. Basham, The Wonder that was India, Rupa & Co., New Delhi, 1990 p. 45).

Therefore if these archives are completely lost to us, why cannot Indian historians take efforts to prevent such loss? Why not they recover the available records?

2. Max Mueller, Biographies of Words and the Home of Aryans, London, 1888, p. 120.

3. Romila Thapar, Which of us Are Aryans?, Seminar, 364, New Delhi, 1989.

....., The Perennial Aryans, Seminar, 12, 1992.

....., Essays in Indian History- Interpreting the past, New Delhi,

R. S. Sharma, Looking for ARYans, Orient Longman, Madras, 1995.

M. G. S. Narayanan, Aryan-Dravidian Dichotomy in the History of South India, Thiruvananthapuram, South Indian Congress, February 25-27, 2002.

....., during an endowment lecture delivered in the 8th session of Tamil Nadu History Congress at Madras on 14-10-2001.

Though Romila Thapar has been careful in supporting Aryan invasion theory because of the mounting archaeological evidences against it, R. S. Sharma has still been vociferous in propagating the theory. M. G. S. Narayanan has however started writing against it as noted above.

G. F. Dales, The Mythical Massacre of Mohenjodaro, The Bulletin of the Pennsylvania University, Vol, XI, No.3, pp. 36-43.

S. B. Deo and Suryanath Kamath (Ed), The Aryan Problem, The Bharatiya Itihasa Sankalana Samiti, Pune, 1993.

David Frawley, Gods, Sages And Kings: Vedic Secrets of ancient India, salt Lake City, USA, Passage Press, 1991.

N. S. Rajaram, Aryan Invasion of India: The Myth and the Truth, Voice of India, New Delhi-1993.

N. S. Rajaram, The Politics of History: Aryan Invasion Theory and the Subversion of Scholarship, Voice of India, New Delhi, 1995. The Invasion that Haven was

These are the references, which refute the Aryan invasion theories. The archaeological evidences do not support the Aryan invasion theory.

4. Gim. J. Shaffer, Indus Valley, Baluchistan and Helmland in Chronologies in Old World Archaeology, 3rd edition edited by W. Ehrich, Vol. I, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1992.

....., Cultural Development in the Eastern Punjab, in Studies in the Archaeology and Pakistan edited by Jerome Jacobson, American Institute of asian studies, New Delhi, 1986, p.230

G. Erdosy, hnicity in the Rigveda and its Bearing on tge question of Indo-European Origins, South Asian studies, The British Academy, London, Vol.5, 1989, pp. 36-47

5. H.D. Sankalia, Aspects of Indian History and Archaeology, B. R. Publishing corporation, New Delhi, 1973, p. 268.

Here Sankalia was referring to Heras' Studies in Proto-Indo-Mediterranean Culture (published by Indian Historical Research Institute, Bombay, 1953), where Heras purposely propounded that the IVC was Dravidian sowing seed for Aryan-Dravian divide. The Dravidian protagonists still quote him.

6. James Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture (1910), Low Price Publications, New Delhi, 1997, pp. 9-15.

7. K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, Racial Myths, Politics and Human Unity, Make History, Vol. VI, No. 4, Oct-Nov. 1993.

8. Jacques Barzun, Race: A study in Modern Superstition, Methuen & Co. Ltd., London, 1938, p. 61.

9. Race and Science, UNESCO, New York, Columbia University Press, 1969.

M. F. Ashley Montague, The Myth of Blood, New York, 1942.

.....**Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race**, New York, Columbia University Press, 1969.

These books amply prove the pseudo scientific nature of race hypotheses and theories and the involvement of scholars aiding and abetting politicians.

10. Ajay Mitra Shastri, a noted historian deciphered the 16-line inscription accidentally found at Ayodhya, but R. S. Sharma commented that it might have been planted there – Indian Express, December 1992.

11. Lord Curzon's Budgetary Speech.

T. B. Macaulay's Minutes.

Lawrence Mayo's "Mother India".

12. R. S. Sharma, **Looking for Aryans**, opt. cit.

.....**Aryan Problem and the Horse**, Social Scientist, Vol. 21, Numbers. 7-8, 1993. Printed and distributed free by Tukia Print Communication Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi — 110048 in the form of small booklet during the Indian History Congress. A footnote on the first page claims that the article is based on Dr. M. A. Ansari. Memorial Lecture, 1994, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi.

Parvati Menon **Frontline**

Frontline, Oct/Nov. 2000

Navratna S. Rajaram, Open Page of **The Hindu**, February 19, 2002.

Michael Witzel, **Harappan horses myths and the sciences**, Open Page of **The Hindu** March 5, 2002.

R. Nagasamy, **Horse in Harappa**, Open Page of **The Hindu**, March 12, 2002.

The discussion in the fortnight **Frontline** and the daily **The Hindu** clearly show to what extent the scholars could stoop down to accuse each other instead of presenting the facts to readers. The interesting fact is that none denied the existence of horse bones or horses!

It is evident that the Marxist scholars have activated their interpretations with the more and more archaeological evidences conclusively prove that there was no Aryan invasion. Particularly, Romila Thapar has been very careful in her interpretation.

13. H. D. Sankalia, **Pre-Historic Art in India**, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1978, pp.91-92.

14. P. L., **South Indian Numismatics- Problems and Prospects**, a paper presented during the third Annual conference of & Seminar cum workshop on Numismatics held at Madras on April 16 & 17, 1989, p. 14-15.

Stuart Piggott, **Approach to Archaeology**, Adam & Charles Black, London, 1959, p.22.

15. Wheeler

16. D. H. Gordon, **The Early Use of Metals in India and Pakistan**, Journal of Royal Anthropological Journal, London, IXXX, pp.55ff.

17. B. Prakash and V. Tripathi, **Iron Technology in Ancient India**, in History of Science and Technology, Vol. VI (Metals and Metal Technology), Sundeep Prakashan, New Delhi, 1990, pp.13-51.

18. S. D. Singh, **Journal of the Economic Social History of the Orient**, Leiden, V, 1962, pp.212-216.

D. D. Kosambi, Ibid, vi, 1963, pp.309-318.

19. B. Prakash, **History of Iron and Steel Making in India**, ibid, pp.53-101.

K. C. Verma, **The Iron Age, the Veda and the Historical Urbanization**, Agam Prakashan, New Delhi, 1982, pp. 155-183.

S. R. Rao, **Progress and Prospects of Marine Archaeology in India**, National Institute of Oceanography, Goa, 1987, p.55.

20. V. Tripathi, **From Copper to Iron – A Transition**, Puratattva, 15, 1985.

Panchanan Neogi, *Copper in India*, Janaki Prakashan, Patna, 1979.

Here, the scholars like R. S. Sharma quote selectively from the books, which are favorable to his interpretation and do not even mention about other books. In fact, he has book *Looking of Aryans*, for C-14 dates, he quotes from Tripathy, but he ignores the findings of Tripathy in refuting the theories of Wheeler, Gordon and others and incidentally his own!

21. Vedaprakash, *Was Indian Stone Art Devived from the Chaldeans, Greeks, Romans or Persians?* In Contribution of South India to Indian Art and Architecture, Chennai, 1999, pp.38-45.
22. H. D. Sankalia, *Ramayana –Myth or Reality*, Peoples a Publishing Co. New Delhi-1973.
23. A.K.L. Basham, *The Wonder that Was India*, p.221,355,366-367.
24. K. D. Sethna, *Ancient India in a New Light*, Aditya Prakashan New Delhi, 1989, pp. 390-394.
25. E. B. Havell, *Indian Architecture Through Ages*, Asian Publications Services, 1978, pp. 4,5,10,14,16,40-41.
These scholars have pointed out the existence of the so-called Ashokan pillars even before Ashoka. In fact, thus, K. D. Sethna has placed Ashoka in 950 BCE, Budhha in 1168 BCE, Mahavira in 1171 BCE.
26. William Jones, On Chronology in Asiatic Researches.
27. F. E. Pargiter, *Ancient Historical Tradition*, Motilal, 1999, New Delhi (Reprint).
28. R. Morton Smith, *Dates and Dynasties in Earliest India*, Motilal New Delhi, 1973.
....., *Ramayana in Historical Prespective*, MacMillan India Ltd., New Delhi, 1982.
29. Alexander Kondratov, *The Riddles of Three Oceans*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974.
30. K. Appadurai, *Kumarikkandam*, Kazagam, Madras.
31. P. Joseph, *Lost Lemuria – Fresh Evidence*, Tamil Culture, Vol. VII-2, April 1958.

Kumarikkandam and Indus Valley Civilization (Souvenir), Madras, May 13-14, 1994.

There are other Dravidologists like N. Mahalingam, R. Mathivanan, Sattur Sekharan, K. Velu, S. Padmanabhan etc, who much delve on the literary evidences and their further interpretative exploitations without giving any historical evidences. These writers fervently try to associate Dravidians with that of IVC. but the Sangam literature does not support it. Moreover, their hatred towards Sanskrit and Sanskrit literature mar the objective study and research leading to biased, one-sided, emotional writings. Moreover, they again and again tehash the same old materials available some 50-1000 years back.

32. Oscar Handlin, *Truth in History*, The Beluap Press, 1979.

In the preface itself, under the title, The Abuses of History, the writer notes as follows:

"The 1970s added an economic dimension to the plaintive apologetics since most historians earned their livelihood by teaching, they suffered during that unhappy decade when education abruptly became a buyer's market. Presuaded of the need to choose relevance, students shopped avidly for the best bargains in learning; and many institutions the study of history suffered. To protect their jobs, historians like other faculty members, set about demonstrating the utility of subject matter they purveyed" (p. vii).

Now, it may be noted that the same situation prevails in India ever since the 10+2 system was introduced with emphasis on job/career related degrees and courses.